

**REMARKS**

A. Amendments to Claims.

Claims 12-16 have been canceled for purposes of expediting allowance of the remaining claims. The cancellation is without prejudice to representation and prosecution of the claims in a continuing or divisional application. In view of the cancellation, Claim 32 is also amended to depend solely from Claim 1.

B. Response to Written Description Rejection

Claims 1-4, 12-16 & 32 are rejected under Section 112, first paragraph, for lack of written description to support the limitation requiring “an ectoparasitocidal agent consisting essentially of isopropyl myristate at a concentration between 35% and 70% w/w.” As noted above, Claims 12-16 are canceled. The following remarks are therefore directed to Claims 1-4 and 32.

The written description rejection is based on the following:

“Applicant directs us to [0020] as support for 35%; BUT, only siloxanes are shown there as 35%...”.

Office Action at page 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that this reading of the Specification is incorrect. The Specification clearly supports the concentration limitations of Claim 1:

“It is preferred that **the fatty acid ester** be present at **less than 65% or 70% w/w** and at **more than 20%, 25%, or 35%....”**.”.

Paragraph [0020], emphasis added.

The Office Action also again refers to the insecticidal activity of siloxane. However, the claims recite that the ectoparasiticide agent of the composition **consists essentially of** isopropyl myristate. The remainder of the composition consists of a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. As stated in Paragraph [0021]:

“In other embodiments, the fatty acid ester is present in the composition with a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. [The carrier need not be siloxane, rather] those of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that other pharmaceutically acceptable carriers are also useful. In those embodiments, the fatty acid ester is used at the concentration described above [i.e., at least 35% and up to 70% w/w], with **the rest of the composition being one or more carriers or other ingredients as desired.**”

Emphasis added.

It is therefore submitted that the claims as presently pending are clearly supported by the written description of the invention provided in the Specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-4 and 32 is therefore respectfully requested.

In re Application of:  
William R. Campbell et al.  
Application No.: 10/692,979  
Filed: October 24, 2003  
Page 6

Attorney Docket No.: PIED1110-1


**CONCLUSION**

All of the pending claims (1-4 and 32) are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is therefore respectfully requested.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this Response. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any other fees that may be due in connection with the filing of this paper, or credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 07-1896, referencing the above-identified docket number.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 10, 2012

  
Stacy L. Taylor  
Registration No. 34,842  
Telephone: (858) 677-1423  
Facsimile: (858) 677-1465

DLA PIPER LLP (US)  
4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100  
San Diego, California 92121-2133  
**USPTO Customer Number 28213**